

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 12, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 17 and 20 and added claims 23-31. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,534 to Geiger. Applicants have reviewed this reference in detail and do not believe that it discloses or makes obvious the invention as claimed.

The Geiger patent describes a system for downloading software to a mobile device, where a certificate ensures that the software is executed only on the particular device specified by the serial number stored in the certificate.

The Geiger device does not, however, describe configuring hardware responsive to data in a certificate. The Examiner (in connection with previous claim 4) states that this aspect of the invention is shown in Geiger at column 4, lines 23-35 and column 10, lines 7-30.

With regard to the citation at column 4, lines 23-35, Geiger states:

A License Certificate contains information that ties a wireless device 11 with certain access rights. In particular, a License Certificate contains, at a minimum, fields for *software product* and device serial number. The software product field contains a product identifier. This identifier grants the device *a license to use the product*. A device will be able to run the *specified software product* if its internal serial number, embedded in the device, matches the License Certificate's serial number. As in the Public Key Certificate, the data in the License Certificate is hashed and signed by the CA. The device will not be able to verify forged License

Certificates since it won't be able to validate the certificate to the CA's signature (unless the CA has been compromised). (emphasis added)

There is nothing in this citation that indicates that a License Certificate can affect the operation of anything but a software product.

With regard to the citation at column 10, Applicants note that this portion of the specification is not describing how License Certificates control the mobile device (to which the License Certificate applies), but rather the electronic commerce system 10 (which is the system which sends License Certificates to the mobile device) operates. Applicants specifically note the paragraph preceding the citation (column 10, first paragraph) which states:

To describe further aspects of the *electronic commerce system*, the following are not described: the security domains; the attributes to be distributed/protected *in the system*; attribute ownership assigned to domains (note some attributes are owned by more than one domain; and the architecture for the enrollment and authentication of domain members and assignment of attribute.

Hence, the text cited by the examiner has no bearing on how a digital certificate could configure the mobile device 11.

Applicants have amended claim 1, 6, 12 and 17 to recite that the hardware of the processing device is configured responsive to configuration parameters from the certificate. Since this is not shown in Geiger, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims, along with dependent claims 2-5, 7-11, 13-16 and 18-22.

Additionally, Applicants have added dependent claims 23-31, which recite specific ways in which the hardware is modified. The subject matter of these claims is not discussed in Geiger. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims as well.

An extension of three months is requested and a Request for Extension of Time under § 1.136 with the appropriate fee is attached hereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

July 11, 2007
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595